

# **Three Dimensional Discrete Element Modelling of Open-Ended Tubular Pile Penetration in Weak Rocks**

**by Xiangyu Zhang**

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for  
the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

under the supervision of Behzad Fatahi and Hadi Khabbaz

University of Technology Sydney  
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

February 2020

## CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, Xiangyu Zhang declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Ph.D. degree, in the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature:

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

(Xiangyu Zhang)

29 Feb 2020

To My Parents

## Acknowledgement

Pursuing doctoral studies is challenging and exciting. This four-year journey would not have been possible without the guidance and support from my supervisors, and those who helped me, encouraged me, and accompanied me.

Firstly, I would like to express my most cordial gratitude to my principal supervisor A/Prof Behzad Fatahi and my co-supervisor A/Prof Hadi Khabbaz for their structured guidance, continuous support, understanding, and patience not only limited to the specific field of study but beyond. My Ph.D. thesis could not have been achieved without their constructive feedback and worthy recommendations.

I would like to express my very great appreciation to the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology (FEIT) at UTS and the Centre of Built Infrastructure Research (CBIR) for providing me the platform to pursue my Ph.D.

I would also like to thank my friends, colleagues, and staffs in the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering for their kind assistance.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge my parents for their love, care, encouragement, understanding, and all the sacrifices they have made to support me throughout my study, without whom I would never have enjoyed so many opportunities.

## List of Publications

- Published Journal Articles

**Zhang, X.**, Fatahi, B., Khabbaz, H. & Poon, B. 2019, Assessment of the Internal Shaft Friction of Tubular Piles in Jointed Weak Rock Using the Discrete-Element Method, *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, vol. 33, no. 6, p. 04019067.

- Published Conference Papers

**Zhang, X.**, Fatahi, B., and Khabbaz, H., 2018, ‘Investigating Effects of Individual Fracture Length on Behaviour of Weak Rock Using Discrete Element Method’, 5th GeoChina International Conference (GeoChina 2018), Hangzhou, China.

**Zhang, X.**, Fatahi, B., and Khabbaz, H., 2018, ‘Investigating Effects of Fracture Aperture and Orientation on the Behaviour of Weak Rock Using Discrete Element Method’, GeoShanghai International Conference 2018 (GeoShanghai 2018), Shanghai, China.

**Zhang, X.**, Fatahi, B., Khabbaz, H. and Zhang, H., 2017, ‘Investigating Effects of Fracture Density on Stress-Strain Behaviour of Jointed Rocks Using Discrete Element Method’, The 15th International Conference of the International Association for Computer Methods and Advances in Geomechanics (15IACMAG), Wuhan, China.

## Table of Contents

<b>CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgement.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Publications .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures .....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>List of Tables.....</b>	<b>xviii</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>xx</b>
<b>Nomenclature .....</b>	<b>xxii</b>
<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>xxviii</b>
<b>Chapter 1 - Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 General.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Statement of the Problem.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.3 Research Objectives.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.4 Significance of Research.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.5 Organisation of the Thesis .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Chapter 2 - Literature Review .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.1 General.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.2 Ultimate Axial Capacity .....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.2.1 Bearing Capacity of Tubular Piles in Sands and Clays .....	12
2.2.2 Bearing Capacity in Weak Rocks .....	22
<b>2.3     Open-ended Tubular Piles .....</b>	<b>25</b>

2.3.1 Soil Plug.....	25
2.3.2 Factors Affecting the Degree of Plugging .....	29
2.3.3 Effect of Pile Shoes.....	34
<b>2.4 Characteristics of Weak Rocks.....</b>	<b>38</b>
2.4.1 Formation and Classification .....	39
2.4.2 Discontinuities .....	43
2.4.3 Weak Rock Mass Strength.....	44
<b>2.5 Numerical Analysis.....</b>	<b>46</b>
2.5.1 Finite Element Method .....	48
2.5.2 Discrete Element Method .....	51
2.5.3 Coupled Analysis .....	57
<b>2.6 Case History of Driven Tubular Piles on the Macleay River (NSW, Australia).58</b>	
<b>2.7 Summary and Gap Identification.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Chapter 3 - Investigating the Mechanical Behaviour of Weak Rocks.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>3.1 General.....</b>	<b>62</b>
3.1.1 Fundamentals of Flat-joint Model .....	64
3.1.2 Fundamentals of Smooth-joint Contact Model.....	68
<b>3.2 Effects of Joint Density.....</b>	<b>70</b>
3.2.1 Numerical Modelling.....	71
3.2.3 Results and Discussions.....	74
<b>3.3 Effects of Rock Joints .....</b>	<b>79</b>
3.3.1 Discrete Element Simulation .....	79

3.3.2 Effects of Joint Dip on the Mechanical Properties of Jointed Rock .....	84
3.3.3 Effects of Joint Aperture on the Mechanical Properties of Jointed Rock.....	85
<b>3.4 Effects of Joint Length .....</b>	<b>87</b>
3.4.1 Numerical Modeling .....	88
3.4.2 Results and discussions.....	95
<b>3.5 Summary .....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Chapter 4 - Assessment of the Internal Shaft Friction .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>4.1 General.....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>4.2 Background .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>4.3 Discrete Element Simulations .....</b>	<b>109</b>
4.3.1 Calibration of Discrete Element Model .....	109
4.3.2 Push-up Load Tests in Tubular Pile on Jointed Mudstone .....	113
<b>4.4 Effect of Loading Rate.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>4.5 Effect of Joint Density .....</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>4.6 Effects of Joint Dip .....</b>	<b>124</b>
4.6.1 Effect of Joint Dip on the Triaxial Shear Test Results .....	124
4.6.2 Effect of Joint Dip on Push-up Load Test .....	125
<b>4.7 Summary .....</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>Chapter 5 - Investigation of the Axial Load Transfer Mechanism.....</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>5.1 General.....</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>5.2 Background .....</b>	<b>135</b>



<b>5.3</b>	<b>Numerical Modelling .....</b>	<b>141</b>
5.3.1	Fundamentals of the Contact Model .....	141
5.3.2	Calibration of the Adopted Contact Model for Weak Rock .....	144
5.3.3	Numerical Modelling of Pile Penetration .....	147
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Results and Discussions .....</b>	<b>152</b>
5.4.1	Predicted Resistances .....	152
5.4.2	Unit Shaft Frictions .....	155
5.4.3	Particle Displacement Patterns .....	157
5.4.4	Porosity and Stress Distributions .....	158
<b>5.5</b>	<b>Impacts of Pile Shoe .....</b>	<b>163</b>
5.5.1	Predicted Resistances for Pile with Driving Shoe .....	163
5.5.2	Effect of Pile Shoe on Unit Shaft Frictions .....	165
5.5.3	Porosity and Stress Distributions for Pile with Driving Shoe .....	166
<b>5.6</b>	<b>Degree of Plugging .....</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>5.7</b>	<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>176</b>
<b>Chapter 6 - Conclusion .....</b>		<b>179</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Key Concluding Remarks .....</b>	<b>180</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Recommendations for Future Studies .....</b>	<b>185</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>		<b>187</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1. Representative of the DEM modelling of simulating the open-ended tubular pile penetrating in rock masses.....	3
Figure 2.1. Soil disturbance beneath (a) a single solid pile; and (b) an open-ended tubular pile (after Tomlinson and Woodward 2008) .....	11
Figure 2.2. Load bearing components of open-ended tubular piles for (a) fully coring pile; and (b) plugged pile.....	15
Figure 2.3. Possible failure mechanism for open-ended piles (a) fully coring, (b) partially plugged, and (c) fully plugged (after White et al. 2005; Igwe et al. 2009; Ko and Jeong 2014) .....	27
Figure 2.4. Prediction of potential plugging in sand based on field evidence (after Jardine et al. 2005).....	31
Figure 2.5. Schematic diagram of (a) the shear zone adjacent to the pile shaft; (b) variation in the shear zone during driving (after Yu and Yang 2011).....	32
Figure 2.6. Different types of pile shoes: (a) outer shoe; (b) inner shoe; and (c) thick plate shoe (after Tomlinson and Woodward 2008).....	35
Figure 2.7. Hypothesised stress changes due to driving shoe in sandy soil: (a) the soil flow for open-ended tubular pile with inner pile shoe; (b) the soil flow for open-ended tubular pile with outer pile shoe; and (c) stress change at zone I, II, and III for open-ended tubular pile with inner shoe (after De Nicola and Randolph 1997; White et al. 2000) .....	36
Figure 2.8. Formation of weak rocks and their position in the soil and rock mechanics (after Dobereiner and Freitas 1986; Zhai et al. 2017).....	41

Figure 2.9. Normalised rock mass strength against GSI illustrating marked differences between conventional Hoek-Brown behaviour (after Carter et al. 2008).....	46
Figure 2.10. Finite element model and boundaries conditions for analysis of plug mechanism (Liyanapathirana et al. 1998).....	50
Figure 2.11. “Zipper-type” technique for simulating pile penetration process in FEA (Henke and Grabe 2008) .....	51
Figure 2.12. An example of the Geometry of the CPT test in DEM (Ciantia et al. 2016) ..	53
Figure 2.13. Arch development during penetration (after Li et al. 2019) .....	57
Figure 2.14. Finite element mesh and geometry for the soil domain in the CEL analysis of driving open-ended piles (Ko et al. 2016) .....	58
Figure 3.1. Behaviour of flat-joint contact (a) schematic diagram of flat-joint contact with the notional surfaces; (b) rheological components and behaviour of the unbonded element; and (c) rheological components and behaviour of the bonded element .....	66
Figure 3.2. The schematic illustration of smooth-joint contact model of (a) before installation; and (b) after installation.....	69
Figure 3.3. (a) Numerical model for intact rock specimen; (b) Failure mode for intact rock (yellow: shear crack and grey: tension crack); and (c) Smooth-joint contact model for simulating joints .....	72
Figure 3.4. Stress-strain curve of the intact rock specimen under unconfined compression test.....	73
Figure 3.5. Discrete fracture network for specimen with joint density values of (a) $10 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ , (b) $50 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ , (c) $100 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ , and (d) $200 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ .....	74

Figure 3.6. Effect of joint density on rock mass unconfined compressive strength of jointed rock specimens .....	75
Figure 3.7. Failure mechanism for specimens with joint density values of (a) $10 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ , (b) $50 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ , (c) $100 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ , and (d) $200 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ (green: joint; yellow: shear crack and grey: tension crack).....	76
Figure 3.8. Effect of joint density on Young's modulus of jointed rock specimens .....	77
Figure 3.9. (a) Numerical model of the intact rock specimen, and (b) numerical representation of the rock grains with the flat-joint contact and the joint with the smooth-joint contact .....	80
Figure 3.10. The stress-strain curve of experimental measurements and model predictions of the intact rock specimen for confining pressure of 392 kPa .....	82
Figure 3.11. Representative of jointed rock specimen with the joint dip ( $\alpha$ ) to the direction of cell pressure.....	83
Figure 3.12. Normalised deviatoric strength at 15% axial strain of jointed specimen for different joint dips and apertures .....	84
Figure 3.13. Volumetric strain at 15% axial strain of jointed specimens with different joint dips and apertures .....	85
Figure 3.14. Comparisons of the intact specimen and jointed specimens with different joint apertures for the given joint dip of $30^\circ$ .....	86
Figure 3.15. Volumetric strain of different joint apertures for jointed rock specimens .....	87
Figure 3.16. (a) Numerical model of intact rock specimen under triaxial test with six rigid walls; (b) Contact force chain for intact rock specimen (line thickness and dip represent force	

magnitude and direction, respectively), and (c) The smooth-joint contact model for simulating joints .....	90
Figure 3.17. Stress-strain curve of the intact rock specimen calibration exercise.....	92
Figure 3.18. Volumetric strain variations of the intact rock specimen during shearing - calibration exercise .....	92
Figure 3.19. Discrete fracture network for the rock specimen with individual joint length of (a) 140 mm, (b) 84 mm, (c) 11.2 mm, and (d) 5.6 mm, (Note: the joint density remains constant $\xi = 7 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$ ) .....	95
Figure 3.20. Predicted stress-strain curves of jointed specimens with different individual joint length.....	96
Figure 3.21. Volumetric strain of jointed specimens with different individual joint length .....	97
Figure 3.22. Applied axial stress to cell pressure ratio ( $\sigma_1/\sigma_3$ ) versus the ratio of individual joint length to the specimen width ( $\eta/L$ ) at 15% axial strain .....	97
Figure 3.23. Volumetric strain versus normalised joint length for jointed rock specimens	98
Figure 3.24. Particle displacement representation for jointed specimens at the axial strain of 15 % with normalised joint length ( $\eta/L$ ) of (a) 1.4, (b) 0.84, (c) 0.28, (d) 0.112, (e) 0.056, and (f) 0.028 (grey: particle displacement and black: smooth-joint model contacts for joints) .....	99
Figure 4.1. (a) Application of steel tubular piles for bridge foundation; and (b) installation technique for the tubular piles, for Pacific Highway Upgrade project in east coast of Australia .....	103

Figure 4.2. Components of bearing-capacity of an open-ended tubular pile .....	105
Figure 4.3. UCS test results for (a) high strength Phyllite before testing; (b) high strength Phyllite after testing; (c) low strength Phyllite before testing; and (d) low strength Phyllite after testing .....	106
Figure 4.4. Back-calculated pile shaft resistances obtained from CAPWAP analysis for rocks with different point load strength indexes .....	107
Figure 4.5. (a) Numerical model for intact mudstone under triaxial loading; and (b) displacement of individual grains of the specimen at an axial strain of 0.8% .....	110
Figure 4.6. Stress-strain curves of triaxial tests from experimental and calibration exercises, (a) deviatoric stress against axial strain, and (b) deviatoric stress against lateral strain ...	112
Figure 4.7. Analysis models of the push-up load test of model components and model dimensions.....	114
Figure 4.8. Representation of the jointed rock plugs with joint dip of 0° and joint density of (a) 1.1 m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> , (b) 4.4 m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> , and (c) 8.9 m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> .....	116
Figure 4.9. Comparison of loading rates on the push-up load tests.....	118
Figure 4.10. Behaviour of intact rock plug of (a) relationship between push-up displacement and force, and (b) vertical stress along the rock plug.....	120
Figure 4.11. Relationship of the push-up displacement and force of jointed rock plugs with joint density of (a) 1.1 m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> , (b) 4.4 m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> , and (c) 8.9 m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> .....	123
Figure 4.12. Stress-strain curves of triaxial test for intact and jointed specimens, (a) deviatoric stress against axial strain, and (b) deviatoric stress against lateral strain.....	125

Figure 4.13. Yield axial stress of (a) rock plug in push-up load test, and (b) rock mass in triaxial test .....	127
Figure 4.14. Displacement of individual grains of push-up load test for (a) intact rock plug, (b) joint dip of 0°, (c) joint dip of 30°, (d) joint dip of 45°, (e) joint dip of 60°, and (f) joint dip of 90° .....	128
Figure 4.15. Distribution of unit shaft friction along the rock plugs with joint density of 4.4 m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> and joint dip of (a) 0°, (b) 30°, (c) 45°, (d) 60°, and (e) 90° .....	131
Figure 5.1. (a) flat-jointed particles with the contact interface; and (b) representatives of the elements discretised from the interface .....	141
Figure 5.2. Rheological components of the flat-joint model for (a) bonded element, and (b) unbonded element.....	142
Figure 5.3. (a) Numerical triaxial test sample dimension; (b) particle displacement at the end of the triaxial test for confining pressure of 100 kPa; and (c) particle displacement at the end of the triaxial test for confining pressure of 350 kPa. ....	145
Figure 5.4. Calibration exercises comparing with the experimental results for the weak rock .....	146
Figure 5.5. Geometry and dimension of the (a) the testing chamber; (b) the tested open-ended tubular pile; and (c) schematic diagram of the open-ended tubular pile with and without a shoe.....	148
Figure 5.6. (a) Schematic illustration of the top view of the testing chamber with particle refinement upscale factors and radial distances; and (b) the side view of the measurements from top to bottom of the model.....	150

Figure 5.7. The initial condition of the large-scale model of (a) distribution of the porosity, and (b) vertical stress and radial stress .....	152
Figure 5.8. Pile resistance of open-ended tubular pile with depth .....	153
Figure 5.9. Contact network for the open-ended tubular pile without driving shoe at a penetration depth of (a) 0.4 m, and (b) 1.0 m.....	155
Figure 5.10. (a) Unit internal shaft friction of open-ended tubular pile at different penetration depths; and (b) Unit external shaft friction of open-ended tubular pile at different penetration depths.....	156
Figure 5.11. Individual particle displacement of the open-ended tubular pile without pile shoe at a pile penetration depth of (a) 0.1 m, (b) 0.5 m, and (c) 1.0 m .....	158
Figure 5.12. The porosity distribution pile before and after driving for the open-ended tubular pile (a) at the location inside the pile; and (b) at the location outside and adjacent to the pile .....	159
Figure 5.13. Stresses at different depth for open-ended pile: (a) radial stress at 0.2 m, (b) vertical stress at 0.2 m, (c) radial stress at 1 m, (d) radial stress at 1 m, and (e) peak stresses at 0.2 m and 1 m .....	162
Figure 5.14. Pile resistance of open-ended tubular pile with an inner pile shoe .....	163
Figure 5.15. Contact network for the open-ended tubular pile with driving shoe at a penetration depth of (a) 0.1 m, and (b) 1.0 m.....	165
Figure 5.16. Comparison of the unit external and internal shaft friction for open-ended tubular piles with and without shoe.....	166
Figure 5.17. Individual particle displacement of the open-ended tubular pile with inner pile shoe at a penetration depth of (a) 0.1 m, (b) 0.5 m, and (c) 1.0 m .....	167



Figure 5.18. The porosity distribution pile before and after driving for the open-ended tubular pile with the inner shoe (a) at the location inside the pile; and (b) at the location outside and adjacent to the pile.....	168
Figure 5.19. Stresses at different depth for open-ended pile with the inner shoe: (a) radial stress at 0.2 m, (b) vertical stress at 0.2 m, (c) radial stress at 1 m, (d) radial stress at 1 m, and (e) peak stresses at 0.2 m and 1 m .....	171
Figure 5.20. IFR and PLR values of open-ended tubular piles with and without driving shoe .....	173
Figure 5.21. Inclination angle of the top surface of the rock plug in relation to (a) PLR, and (b) IFR .....	174
Figure 5.22. Relationship between the PLR and IFR and compared with other studies ...	175

## List of Tables

Table 2.1. Some of the recommended design parameters for cohesionless siliceous soils (after American Petroleum Institute 2002).....	16
Table 2.2. Bearing resistance factor $Nk$ proposed by different researchers (after Irvine et al. 2015).....	23
Table 2.3. $Ks$ for different tectonic stress levels (after González de Vallejo and Hijazo 2008; Terente et al. 2017).....	24
Table 2.4. Summary of factors affecting the degree of plugging .....	30
Table 2.5. Usual type of weak rocks (after Kanji 2014).....	40
Table 2.6. Summary of classification systems of weak rocks .....	42
Table 2.7. Uniaxial compressive strength and description of shales and sandstones as related to porosity (after Klein 2001) .....	43
Table 2.8. Comparison of FEM and DEM methods for pile penetration problems .....	47
Table 2.9. Examples of 2D DEM simulations on the pile installation process or CPT test	54
Table 2.10. Examples of 3D DEM simulations on the pile installation process or CPT test .....	56
Table 2.11. Interpreted design values for shaft friction and base resistance of tubular piles in different subsurface conditions (Zhang et al. 2013) .....	59
Table 3.1. Summary of microparameters for the intact rock specimen.....	73
Table 3.2. Details of tested specimens, rock mass unconfined compressive strength ratio and Young's modulus ratio of jointed rock to intact rock.....	78

Table 3.3. The joint apertures and dips investigated in the study .....	83
Table 3.4. Summary of calibrated flat-joint parameters for the intact weak rock specimen .....	93
Table 3.5. Summary of smooth-joint parameters for joints.....	93
Table 3.6. Different joint configurations used in the simulation of jointed rock sample....	94
Table 4.1. Calibrated parameters used in the discrete element modelling of weak mudstone in the triaxial test .....	113
Table 4.2. Micro-parameters of smooth-joint contact for the joints adopted in this study	115
Table 4.3. Predicted push-up forces at the yielding point for jointed rock plugs.....	122
Table 5.1. The calibrated micro-parameters adopted in the numerical model to simulate pyroclastic weak rock .....	147

## List of Abbreviations

API:	American Petroleum Institute
BPM:	Bonded Particle Model
CAPWAP:	Case Pile Wave Analysis Program
CEL:	Coupled Eulerian-Lagrangian
CPT:	Cone Penetration Test
DEM:	Discrete Element Method
DFN:	Discrete Fracture Network
FEA:	Finite Element Analysis
FEM:	Finite Element Method
FinnRA:	Finnish National Road Administration
FJM:	Flat-joint Model
GSI:	Geological strength index
HKU:	Hong Kong University
ICP:	Imperial College Pile
IFR:	Incremental Filling Ratio
LCPC:	Laboratoire Central des Ponts et Chaussées

NGI:	Norwegian Geotechnical Institute
PFC3D:	Particle Flow Code in Three Dimension
PLR:	Plug Length Ratio
RMR:	Rocking mass rating
SJM:	Smooth-joint Contact Model
USC:	Unconfined Compressive Strength
UWA:	University of Western Australia

## Nomenclature

The following notations are used in this research:

$A$ :	Constant;
$A^e$ :	area of the element (m <sup>2</sup> );
$A_p$ :	gross end area of the pile (m <sup>2</sup> );
$A_r$ :	effective area ratio (non-dimensional);
$A_s$ :	shaft area of the pile (m <sup>2</sup> );
$A_{shoe}$ :	area of the driving shoe (m <sup>2</sup> );
$A^{sj}$ :	area of the smooth-joint cross-section (m <sup>2</sup> );
$B$ :	Constant;
$C$ :	Constant;
$c$ :	undrained shear strength of soil (kPa);
$c_c$ :	contact cohesion (Pa);
$D$ :	pile diameter (m);
$D_{CPT}$ :	cone diameter (m);
$D_{inner}$ :	inner diameter of the pile (m);
$D_{outer}$ :	outer diameter of the pile (m);
$D_r$ :	relative density (non-dimensional);
$d_{50}$ :	median particle diameter (mm);
$d_{max}$ :	maximum diameter of the particles (mm);
$d_{min}$ :	minimum diameter of the particles (mm);
$E_c$ :	Young's modulus at each particle contact (Pa);
$E_f$ :	Young's modulus values for jointed specimens (MPa);

$E_i$ :	Young's modulus values for intact specimens (MPa);
$e$ :	void ratio (non-dimensional);
$F_n^{sj}$ :	normal force carried by the smooth-joint contact (N);
$F_n^{sj-\psi}$ :	shear force due to dilation (N);
$F_s^{sj}$ :	shear force of smooth-joint contact (N);
$F_s^{sj-c}$ :	shear force determined by the imposed Coulomb limit (N);
$F_s^{sj-s}$ :	shear force determined by the force-displacement law (N);
$(F_n^{sj})_0$ :	initial normal force carried by the smooth-joint contact (N);
$\bar{F}_n^e$ :	normal force acting at the element (N);
$\bar{F}_s^e$ :	shear force acting at the element (N);
$f_T(\sigma_{ci})$ :	correction factor for transition material (non-dimensional);
$f$ :	unit skin friction (kPa);
$f_{s-i}$ :	unit internal shaft friction (kN/m);
$f_{s-o}$ :	unit external shaft friction (kN/m);
$G$ :	operational shear modulus (GPa);
$g$ :	interface gap (m);
$H_Z$ :	embedded shaft length (m);
$H_i$ :	penetration depth (m);
$H_{plug}$ :	height of the rock plug (m);
$\Delta H$ :	change in pile penetration depth (m);
$h$ :	height of soil layer above the pile toe (m);
$I_{s(50)}$ :	point load strength index (MPa);
$I_{v0}$ :	relative void index (non-dimensional);

$I_{vy}$ :	relative void index at yield (non-dimensional);
$K$ :	coefficient of lateral earth pressure (non-dimensional);
$K_c$ :	a factor depend on yield stress ratio (non-dimensional);
$K_f$ :	coefficient of radial effective stress at failure (non-dimensional);
$K_s$ :	coefficient of horizontal stress of rock mass (non-dimensional);
$k^*$ :	normal-to-shear stiffness ratio (non-dimensional);
$k_n$ :	contact normal stiffness (Pa/m);
$k_{ns}$ :	contact normal stiffness for smooth-joint contact (Pa/m);
$k_s$ :	contact shear stiffness (Pa/m);
$k_{ss}$ :	contact shear stiffness for smooth-joint contact (Pa/m);
$L$ :	smallest characteristic model length (m);
$l_i$ :	soil plug length (m);
$\Delta l$ :	incremental change of plug length (m);
$m_b, m_i, s$ , and $a$ :	original Hoek-Brown parameters;
$m_b^*, s^*$ , and $a^*$ :	corrected Hoek-Brown parameters;
$N_c$ :	bearing capacity factor (non-dimensional);
$N_q$ :	bearing capacity factor (non-dimensional);
$N_\gamma$ :	bearing capacity factor (non-dimensional);
$P_a$ :	atmospheric pressure (kPa);
$p'_0$ :	effective overburden pressure (kPa);
$Q_{annular}$ :	resistance of the annular area (kN);
$Q_b$ :	ultimate resistance of the base (kN);
$Q_{base}$ :	resistance of the equivalent base (kN);
$Q_{bottom}$ :	bearing capacity of the soil beneath the plug base (kN);



$Q_{inner}$ :	bearing capacity of inner shaft (kN);
$Q_{outer}$ :	resistance of outer shaft (kN);
$Q_p$ :	ultimate resistance of the pile (kN);
$Q_{plug}$ :	bearing capacity of soil plug (kN);
$Q_s$ :	ultimate resistance of the shaft (kN);
$q$ :	unit end bearing capacity (kPa);
$q_c$ :	local CPT tip resistance (kPa);
$q_{uc}$ :	uniaxial compressive strength of the intact rock (MPa);
$R$ :	radius of the pile (m);
$R^*$ :	equivalent radius of the pile (m);
$R^A$ :	radii of the contacting particle A (m);
$R^B$ :	radii of the contacting particle B (m);
$R^{fj}$ :	radius of the flat-joint contact (m);
$R_{inner}$ :	inner radius of the pile (m);
$R_{outer}$ :	outer radius of the pile (m);
$r$ :	radial distance (m);
$\Delta r$ :	radial displacement (m);
$S_t$ :	clay sensitivity (non-dimensional);
$T$ :	tensile strength of the rock mass (MPa);
$t_{pile}$ :	thickness of the pile (mm);
$t_{pile}$ :	pile wall thickness (mm);
$UCS$ :	unconfined compressive strength (MPa);
$UCS_{RM}$ :	uniaxial compressive strength of rock mass (MPa);

$UCS_f$ :	unconfined compressive strength for jointed rock (MPa);
$UCS_i$ :	uniaxial compressive strength of intact rock material (MPa);
$W$ :	width of the base (m);
$W_p$ :	weight of the pile (m);
$Z$ :	depth (m);
$\alpha$ :	joint dip (degree);
$\beta$ :	adhesion factor (non-dimensional);
$\chi$ :	a multiplier (non-dimensional);
$\gamma$ :	effective density of the rock mass (kg/m <sup>2</sup> );
$\delta$ :	friction angle between the soil and pile wall (degree);
$\delta$ :	friction angle between pile and soil (degree);
$\delta_{cv}$ :	interface angle of friction at failure (degree);
$\delta_f$ :	operational interface angle of frictional failure (degree);
$\Delta\delta_n^{sj}$ :	elastic portions of the normal displacement increment (m);
$\Delta\delta_s^{sj}$ :	shear displacement increment (m);
$\phi$ :	internal friction angle (degree);
$\phi_c$ :	contact friction angle (degree);
$\phi_{rc}$ :	contact residual friction angle (degree);
$\eta$ :	plugging coefficient (non-dimensional);
$\eta$ :	individual joint length (mm);
$\psi$ :	dilation angle (degree);
$\lambda$ :	radius multiplier (non-dimensional);
$\mu_c$ :	contact friction coefficient;

$\mu_{cs}$ :	contact friction coefficient for smooth-joint contact;
$\sigma_1$ :	major principle stress (kPa);
$\sigma_3$ :	minor principle stress (kPa);
$\sigma_b$ :	normal stress on the notional surface (Pa);
$\sigma_c$ :	contact tensile strength (Pa);
$\sigma_{ci}$ :	uniaxial compressive strength (MPa);
$\sigma^e$ :	normal stress in the element (Pa);
$\sigma'_{rc}$ :	equalized radial effective stress (kPa);
$\sigma'_{rc}$ :	local radial effective stress (kPa);
$\sigma_{ten}$ :	tensile strength limit (Pa);
$\sigma'_{vo}$ :	in-situ initial vertical effective stress (kPa);
$\sigma'_{vy}$ :	vertical yield stress (kPa);
$\Delta\sigma'_{rd}$ :	increase in radial effective stress during pile loading (kPa);
$\tau_b$ :	shear strength of the contact (Pa);
$\tau^e$ :	shear stress in the element (Pa);
$\tau_f$ :	local shear stress (kPa);
$\tau_{lim}$ :	shear strength limit (Pa);
$\tau_{sp}$ :	shear strength of the element from slipping (Pa);
$\xi$ :	joint density (m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> );
$\omega$ :	joint aperture (mm);

## Abstract

Open-ended tubular piles, usually made of steel, are commonly used in offshore structures and bridge projects due to the high capacity and less required installation effort. Predicting the load – displacement response of the open-ended piles is of interest to many practicing engineers and researchers. Although the behaviour of the piles embedded in sands and clays has been studied extensively, clear and adequate recommendation is not currently available for predicting the load – displacement response of open-ended piles embedded in weak rocks. However, the increasing number of projects in Australia requires adopting the open-ended piles embedded in weak rock layers to sustain the axial and lateral structural loads. Current recommendations for the design of tubular piles in weak rocks are mainly based on the methods originally proposed for gravels, sands and clays, which cannot predict the shaft and base resistances of tubular piles in weak rocks accurately. Furthermore, the behaviour of weak rock masses is complex due to their characteristics, and the plugging mechanism of tubular piles influenced by the characteristics of the weak rock is not well understood. Therefore, there is a need to enhance the understanding of the load bearing mechanism of open-ended tubular piles embedded in weak rocks to optimise the construction cost and improve safety.

In this thesis, initially the effects of joint properties on the behaviour of weak rock masses are discussed. The discrete element method (DEM) is adopted which can simulate interacting rock grains. The interaction between grains is controlled by the adopted contact models. The flat-joint model that follows the elasto-plastic force-displacement constitutive law is employed in the analysis. Meanwhile, the discrete fracture network (DFN) along with the smooth-joint model are adopted to replicate the sliding of the joints. Initially, the effects of joint dip, joint density, joint aperture, and joint length on the mechanical behaviour of the

rock mass are investigated through simulating unconfined compressive strength and triaxial tests.

Moreover, this research provides an insight into the impacts of joint dip and joint density on the internal shaft friction of open-ended tubular piles through DEM analysis. The flat-joint and smooth-joint contact models are adopted to replicate the rock mass and the sliding of the joints, respectively. The push-up load tests are performed on the intact rock plug and jointed rock plug to analyse the effects of joints on the internal shaft frictions of tubular piles. It is noticed that the joints could reduce the capacity of the rock plug, and the joints parallel to the loading direction have the largest impact compared to other joint dips, where the joints parallel to the axial loading direction in the triaxial test do not result in the lowest strength. This indicates that the internal shaft friction of open-ended tubular piles is not solely a function of the rock strength, and the effects of joint properties need to be taken into consideration.

Furthermore, the axial load bearing mechanism of open-ended tubular piles penetrating into weak rock is discussed. The numerical modelling using the discrete element method is adopted since tubular pile driving involves extremely large displacements that DEM can accommodate. Effects of an inner driving shoe attached to the open-ended tubular pile on the load bearing mechanism is also investigated. The incremental filling ratio (IFR) and plug length ratio (PLR) are used to assess the plugging of the piles. As expected, the base resistance can mobilise at the early stage of the pile penetration, while the internal and external shaft frictions increase continuously as the pile penetrates deeper. The unit internal shaft friction is mainly mobilised at the bottom portion of the rock plug due to the arching effect. Moreover, partial plugging is observed for both piles with and without driving shoe, and the correlations between IFR and PLR are proposed.